

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/021,316	Applicant(s) LUCOVSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner Etienn P LeRoux	Art Unit 2161	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Etienne P LeRoux. (3)_____.

(2) Kevin D Jablonski. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tietjen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued with respect to a proposed amendment that Tietjen does not disclose a markup language document. Examiner concurred but informed applicant that a new search would be required before patentability could be considered. The following claim 4 language was discussed at length: contacts data; document arranged according to a defined schema. Examiner mentioned per patent office procedure above language is being given a broad and general interpretation and thus Tietjen's disclosure reads on above claim limitations.



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER